

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01730 281709Z

44

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05 NSAE-00

PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 DODE-00 H-02 NSC-05

SS-15 OIC-02 CU-02 MC-02 /073 W
----- 027087

O R 281604Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0890

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 5191

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1730

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO, CSCE

SUBJ: CBMS: NOTIFICATION ON MANEUVERS

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

REF: A. STATE 066681; B. USNATO 1531; C. GENEVA 1848; D.

USNATO 1472; E. USNATO 1373

SUMMARY: ON MARCH 26, POLADS HAD EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION ON MANEUVERS CMB. UK REP TABLED FIGURES HIS AUTHORITIES HAD ASSEMBLED ON SOVIET AND WARSAW PACT MANEUVERS. FORMAT OF PRESENTATION OF THESE FIGURES, HOWEVER, WAS DIFFICULT TO DEAL WITH AND IN SOME CASES SELF-CONTRADICTORY. UK REP UNDERTOOK TO SEEK CLARIFICATION AND TO WORK WITH IMS TO FURTHER REFINE AND COORDINATE THIS INFORMATION FOR PRESENTATION TO ALLIES. IN SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT, NETHERLANDS REP MADE DETERMINED FORMAL ATTEMPT TO TRANSFER ALLIANCE COORDINATION ON CERTAIN SUBSTANTIVE ASPECTS OF MANEUVERS CBM TO NATO HEADQUARTERS FROM GENEVA. DUTCH REP UNDER INSTRUCTIONS ASKED THAT ALLIES SEEK INSTRUCTIONS FOR COORDINATION AT NATO
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01730 281709Z

HEADQUARTERS ON FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS: A) TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE "FOLUNTARY BASIS" SOVIET PROPOSAL ACCEPTABLE TO THE ALLIES? AND B) IF THE CONCEPT IS ACCEPTABLE, AT WHAT STAGE SHOULD THE ALLIES INDICATE THIS TO THE SOVIETS? ALLIES' RESPONSES WERE

MIXED WITH U.S., BELGIUM AND FRANCE EXPRESSING CONTINUING PREFERENCE FOR GENEVA AS PRIMARY FORUM FOR ALLIED CONSULTATIONS ON BOTH SUBSTANTIVE AND TACTICAL ASPECTS OF MANEUVERS CBM, WHILE DUTCH OBTAINED FRG, NORWEGIAN AND UK SUPPORT FOR SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSION OF AT LEAST FIRST QUESTION IN POLADS. COMMITTEE AGREED TO SEEK INSTRUCTIONS IN TIME FOR AN APRIL 3 POLADS EXCHANGE ON NETHERLANDS' QUESTIONS, EVEN IF IN SOME CASES THOSE INSTRUCTIONS WERE SIMPLY TO THE EFFECT THAT NATIONS WILL RESPOND TO DUTCH QUESTIONS IN GENEVA. ACTION REQUESTED: INSTRUCTIONS ON RESPONSE TO NETHERLANDS' QUESTIONS IN TIME FOR APRIL 3 POLADS. END SUMMARY.

1. DURING MARCH 26 POLADS DISCUSSION OF CBMS, UK REP (MARGETSON) REPORTED ON SOME PRELIMINARY DATA THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD ASSEMBLED ON SOVIET AND WARSAW PACT MANEUVERS. DISCUSSION REVEALED THAT MUCH OF DATA WAS UNCLEAR AND IN SOME CASES SELF-CONTRADICTORY, AND UK REP UNDERTOOK TO SEEK FURTHER CLARIFICATION AND TO WORK WITH IMS TO REFINE AND COORDINATE THIS INFORMATION FOR PRESENTATION TO ALLIES.

2. THE NETHERLANDS REP (DE RYCK) SAID THE GENEVA NATO CAUCUS WILL NEED DATA ON MANEUVERS EVEN WHILE PROBING THE SOVIET "VOLUNTARY BASIS" PROPOSAL. IN CONNECTION WITH THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES ASKED THAT ALLIES SEEK INSTRUCTIONS ON FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS: A) TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE "VOLUNTARY BASIS" SOVIET PROPOSAL ACCEPTABLE TO THE ALLIES? AND B) IF THE CONCEPT IS ACCEPTABLE, AT WHAT STAGE SHOULD THE ALLIES INDICATE THIS TO THE SOVIETS?

3. THE FRG REP THOUGHT THE FIRST DUTCH QUESTION IS PREMATURE, AS ALLIES MUST FIRST ASK THE SOVIETS TO CLARIFY WHAT THEY MEAN BY "VOLUNTARY BASIS", BUT HE FAVORED AN INSTRUCTED EXCHANGE ON THIS IN POLADS. HE FELT THE SECOND DUTCH QUESTION IS A TACTICAL ONE WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AT GENEVA RATHER THAN IN BRUSSELS. THE NORWEGIAN REP (GAARDER) AGREED IT IS NECESSARY THAT SOVIETS CLARIFY THEIR PROPOSAL BEFORE ALLIES CAN DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01730 281709Z

IT IS ACCEPTABLE. HE TOO FAVORED DISCUSSION OF BASIC STRATEGY AT NATO HEADQUARTERS.

4. U.S. REP (LEDOGAR) SAID THE U.S. WOULD PREFER TO RESPOND TO THE NETHERLANDS QUESTION IN GENEVA. BELGIAN AND FRENCH REPS AGREED. ON PERSONAL BASIS, U.S. REP SAID THAT THE QUESTION OF GENEVA OR EVERE FOR THIS IMPORTANT COORDINATION WAS LESS IMPORTANT THAN THAT ALL ALLIES AGREE ON ONE OR THE OTHER. ALLIES SHOULD NOT TRY TO ACHIEVE PROGRESS WITH SOME CARRYING OUT INSTRUCTED DEMARCHES IN ONE PLACE AND OTHERS REACTING IN OTHER PLACES. U.S. PREFERENCE WAS FOR GENEVA, BUT AS HE THOUGHT U.S. AND CANADA WOULD NOT RESIST IF ALL NON-NORTH AMERICAN ALLIES WANTED TO PROCEED WITH CONSULTATIONS AT NATO HEADQUARTERS.

5. THE TURKISH REP ALSO BELIEVED IT NECESSARY FIRST TO GET SOVIET CLARIFICATION OF THE "VOLUNTARY BASIS" CONCEPT. SINCE ALL THE CSCE PARTICIPANTS ARE SOVEREIGN STATES, ANY ACTION CAN BE CONSIDERED TO BE "VOLUNTARY." HOWEVER, THE IDEA OF CSCE IS TO ACHIEVE COMMITMENTS AND THE TURKISH REP PRESUMED THAT "VOLUNTARY BASIS" MEANS A POLITICAL, MORAL OBLIGATION.

6. CANADIAN REP (FOWELL) INDICATED HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD PROBABLY WISH TO PROBE THE SOVIET POSITION BEFORE OFFERING COMPROMISES ON PARAMETERS. THE UK REP REPORTED LONDON HOLDS THE SAME VIEW; HMG WOULD FIRST WANT THE SOVIETS TO CLARIFY THEIR CONCEPT IN GENEVA BEFORE INDICATING THE DEGREE TO WHICH IT IS ACCEPTABLE. HE ADDED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAVE NO OBJECTION TO DISCUSSING CBMS IN BRUSSELS.

7. COMMENT: A) AFTER MEETING, DUTCH REP APPROACHED U.S. REP, EXPRESSED HIMSELF SATISFIED WITH SUPPORT HE HAD RECEIVED, AND SAID BOTH THE HAGUE AND THE NETHERLANDS CSCE DELEGATION FEEL THAT FOR SECURITY AND OTHER REASONS POLADS IS BETTER FORUM THAN GENEVA CBMS EXPERTS CAUCUS FOR INITIAL COORDINATION OF ALLIED RESPONSE TO THIS IMPORTANT SOVIET MOVE.

B) MEANINGFUL ALLIANCE WORK ON MANEUVERS CBM CONTINUES TO BE BLOCKED BY LACK OF USEFUL DATA ON SOVIET MANEUVERS BOTH IN USSR AND IN WP COUNTRIES. ALTHOUGH UK DEL IS TRYING TO OBTAIN INFORMATION FROM LONDON, ALLIES ARE STILL CLEARLY LOOKING TO U.S. WHILE MISSION HAS AVOIDED CREATING IMPRESSION THAT U.S. WILL CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01730 281709Z

PROVIDE DATA, WE ARE CONVINCED THAT SERIOUS EXAMINATION OF REALISTIC PARAMETERS CANNOT TAKE PLACE WITHOUT SUCH DATA. END COMMENT.

8. ACTION REQUESTED: INSTRUCTIONS ON RESPONSE TO NETHERLANDS' QUESTIONS (PARA 2) IN TIME FOR APRIL 3 POLADS, AND GUIDANCE REFERRED TO IN REF A AS SOON AS IT IS AVAILABLE. PEREZ

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 MAR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO01730
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrzjaw.tel
Line Count: 150
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 066681; B. USNATO 1531; C. GENEVA 1848; D. USNATO 1472; E. USNATO 1373
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <08 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CBMS: NOTIFICATION ON MANEUVERS
TAGS: PFOR, NATO, CSCE
To: STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
GENEVA
MOSCOW
MBFR VIENNA
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006

